

The CONFERENCE BULLETIN

PUBLISHED BY THE
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK

Vol. 33

AUGUST 1930

Number 4



RICHARD C. CABOT, M. D.

Members of the National Conference of Social Work:

In recent years, so far as I know, you have not chosen a president from outside your own profession. That you have done so this year means I take it that you are recognizing today your intimate kinship with the two professions in which I have somewhat extensively dabbled, medicine and teaching. But I hope you do not exclude my chief avocations,—philosophy, music and the outdoor life, for the Boston program fairly bristled with philosophy and recreation. I hope we may have even more music on it next year. I thought the applause after the beautiful singing at our final luncheon showed a real hunger for more.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Knight) tells me that almost every year a number of people are struck with the bright new idea that the program of the next conference ought to centre around a

single topic. Like everyone else, apparently, I have had that idea too. Probably, as my wise advisers tell me, it is impracticable. But ever since Miss Richmond wrote her "Social Diagnosis" I have been hoping, with a doctor's natural impulse, that a great book on "Social Treatment" would appear. So much diagnosis, such careful training on investigation, such a long look before we leap, deserves, I think, a whole session on "Social Treatment" in each of the fields with which the different sections deal. Why shouldn't the 1931 volume of the National Conference Proceedings be that long-awaited *magnum opus* on "Social Treatment"?

My former fellow townsman Michael O'Flaherty Davis, (you may not know his middle name. He doesn't always sign it), before he left us for New York, Chicago and the Rosenwald Foundation, used to test Social Treatment now and then

(Continued on Page 2)

The Boston Conference



MIRIAM VAN WATERS

A president's impressions of a National Conference are a good deal like those of a military staff-officer in a modern battle. Except for the shock of the flashlight pictures one is not under gunfire at all; some one else does most of the work and takes most of the risk. Hence it is to the workers that the real credit belongs. One of the pleasant things about the Conference is the way the past-presidents work. It is so exciting to be president that it will be a full summer's job for me to learn how to be an ex-president. The Boston meeting taught me that all who have ever served the Conference go on caring about it and continue to make their contribution of service. Those who have been leaders one year do routine jobs the next year. This is one of the reasons for the spirit of vitality in the Conference.

Doubtless it is a mistake for social workers to express themselves in military analogies, yet a friend of mine recently called my attention to one of deep significance to Conference members. Robert Louis Stevenson said: "Life is an affair of cavalry". He was referring to the fact that things worthwhile in life are gained by small group of courageous folk who conquer new territory in a surprise attack. If this has meaning for a social enterprise, it is that new positions and advantageous posts can not be maintained, unless speedily all the resources of the group are consolidated behind it. During a National Conference of Social Work leaders of thought and action extend the frontier. Those who go to the Conference and receive new ideas or viewpoints, or meet new and exciting personalities must feel that the frontier has been widened. Then on the return

home to practical tasks of daily routine, it is extremely important that the whole level of work be lifted to conform with what has been gained. It is important also that the goals of the Conference be kept in sight throughout the year.

Coming now to the high-lights of the Boston meeting; the outstanding concrete value, in my opinion was the integration of the program. There was a harmony and balance of subject matter and emphasis. Each division appeared more conscious than ever before of the contributions in related fields. In all the fields of social work there appeared an attempt to grasp the underlying philosophy. This result was the natural outcome of careful planning and mutual discussion by program chairmen months in advance of the meeting. The new plan of the executive committee, whereby each division will hold at least one joint meeting with every other division in a six-year period will do much to bring about further integration.

Now that the Conference has grown so vast that discussion is difficult in most of the meetings it is interesting to note the revival of interest in the so-called, round tables. The Family Welfare Association held nine of these in one day, and the Social Work Publicity Council held four. These discussions were strictly professional and kept sternly to the point by the chairmen. Perhaps similar meetings in other fields are the solution to some of the disadvantages of our tremendous size.

There is room in the National Conference for both types of meetings. I do not share the apprehension, sometimes expressed that the Conference is getting too big for an adequate intercourse of thought and feeling between its members. The Boston Conference which was the largest we have had yet, demonstrated its intensely vital and personal character. This is because the elements which compose it are alive; they come together, not in the interests of mere organization but because they desire to extend their knowledge and to receive and to give inspiration.

Naturally the event which impressed me most was the Conference dinner on Wednesday night, arranged by Alexander Johnson when the past presidents condescended to talk humanly, each for seven minutes. I felt I had wandered unbidden into Olympus, and over-heard the wit and wisdom of the mighty ones. When Jane Addams and Julia Lathrop are present at a Conference it is a heightened experience for everyone. Most of Miss Lathrop's attention this year went to the new Indian Committee, but at the dinner meeting we received her blessing and the incomparable counsel of her statesmanship.

The Conference would not have been complete, without "Orange Juice"

that sparkling play put on, by the Minneapolis folks. In it a well-dressed young social worker gets shot at by one of her relatives. In spite of this warning there were swarms of young well dressed social workers enjoying themselves in Boston. This is my final impression, that the profession is attracting a most promising group of young people, and they appear happy and adequate. I can never imagine them working at social work, just for a job. They seemed to know what they were doing and where they were going.

One of them went to the Exhibit of the National League for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. She looked very thoughtful. Perhaps her state will be the next to go for abolition. At a National Conference each year, someone, I feel quite sure, is challenged to translate thought and inspiration into action.

MIRIAM VAN WATERS.

Los Angeles

President, 1930.

1932 NOMINATIONS

Nominations for officers for 1931-1932 may be sent to the chairman of the Committee on Nominations by any member of the Conference. Officers to be elected at the meeting in Minneapolis, June 14 to 20, are: president, first vice-president, second vice-president, third vice-president and five members of the executive committee to serve for a term of three years.

The chairman of the committee is Karl de Schweinitz, who may be addressed at 311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(Continued from page 1)

at the Boston Dispensary, by following up a group of people there treated and ascertaining whether the social (and medical) treatment had done them any good and if so how much and what. Probably most of you have seen Professor and Mrs. Sheldon Glueck's splendid followup of 500 graduates from the Concord Reformatory in Massachusetts, another revealing test of social treatment. This line of investigation might conceivably be begun now and reported on next June in Minneapolis. If any of you have any ideas for or against these stray thoughts please write me about them at Cambridge, Massachusetts.

I wish you good health, happy labor and clear faith till we meet again.

RICHARD C. CABOT,

President, 1931

Division Reports

DIVISION I—CHILDREN

Reverend Bryan J. McEntegart,
Chairman

As in bygone days the chancellor was designated "Keeper of the King's Conscience", so in these days of democracy the social worker must be the keeper of the public's conscience as regards the maladjusted and handicapped members of society. The sessions of the Children's Division at the Boston conference helped to quicken that conscience, to open up new visions of needs, to explore effective ways of meeting them and to stir discouraged, tired and sluggish wills to renewed striving.

Child welfare has as many facets as a finished diamond. It ranges all the way from infant welfare through foster care to vocational guidance of the adolescent. From out of the great variety of movements and agencies, the Boston program selected four approaches to the child.

The first approach was through the law and its instrumentalities as set forth in the papers on juvenile delinquency, the children's courts and the discussions of state legislative programs. Second came the approach of mental hygiene, considering the parent-child relationship both in the normal family situation and where the child is under foster care. Thirdly, the approach through specialized social agencies included discussions on the training of foster parents, the individualization of the treatment of children in institutions, adequate facilities for colored children and the visiting teacher movement, and also papers dealing with the interrelation of family, children's and mothers' aid work. Fourthly, we had the approach through research which described studies of agencies and of children and the putting into practice of the findings of such research.

At Monday's session, Miss Sophonisba Breckinridge pointed out that while the children's court movement is nation-wide through its inclusion in the statutes of forty-six states, it is not national. The differences in organization and jurisdiction of the courts make them highly local in character. In some places it is not so much a court as a great complicated child welfare agency whose comprehensiveness sometimes seems to retard rather than stimulate the development of local resources for the care of children, the prevention of delinquency and constructive family work. She pleaded for the development of state, federal and private consultation services which will help to develop a national mind concerning the children's courts, a mind holding in interest the necessity of local initiative together with a determination that the advances gained anywhere should, whenever possible, be made serviceable everywhere.

Dr. Raymond Moley of Columbia University questioned whether preventive measures among juveniles were really preventive. Research indicates that a large percentage of young criminals have had no previous juvenile delinquency record. Too little is known of what the relationship is between juvenile delinquency and crime. We need much study before we will understand who should be reached by preventive measures and how they should be influenced when reached.

In the second session, Dr. E. Van Norman Emery of Yale University traced the development of the parent-child relationship step by step. Pointing out its importance and the influences which vitally affect it, he called on social workers in all agencies to give serious consideration to this factor in the lives of the children under their care.

The factors in foster care which affect the relationship between children and their own parents were presented by Mr. Joseph Bonapart of Vista Del Mar, Los Angeles. He maintained that emotional shock is not inherent in the placement situation and that placement no longer involves the complete isolation prevalent in former years. Child care agencies are in a strategic position to condition the responses of parents and children. By careful work they may even build up a relationship between parent and child which transcends that obtaining in the average disadvantaged family.

Under the leadership of Miss Edith Foster of Madison, Wisconsin, an unusually valuable group discussion on "State Legislative Programs for Child Care and Protection" was held. Other group discussions were led by Mr. Leon Frost, Dr. Leon W. Goldrich, Mr. Douglas P. Falconer, and Miss Anna B. Pratt. Topics included training for foster parents, individualizing the treatment of children in institutions, providing adequate facilities for colored children in northern communities, and the work of the visiting teacher.

Mr. Paul Beisser's paper, "Defining the Functional Relationships of Family and Children's Work" was hailed as a distinct contribution to the thinking of social workers on this problem. He described the most vital task shared by family and children's case work as the attack upon parental inadequacy and its products. He asked agreement in the fundamental postulate that there appears to be inherent harm to the child in most of the separations from parents which social workers arrange. On this basis he formulated a series of policies for the coordination of the efforts of family and children's agencies. His constructive recommendations mark a point of departure for progressive development.

At the same session, Miss Rose Porter set forth the beneficial influence which the mothers' aid movement has had on the provision of adequate relief for families and on the conserving of home life for children. At the same time, she pointed out that real success in mothers' aid work depends upon administrative policies, which have often lagged behind legislation. While conceding that many mothers' aid families do not require intensive case work treatment, Miss Porter stressed the great opportunity which lies before an adequate, trained staff to introduce recognized standards of family and children's agencies into mothers' aid work.

In the session on child welfare research, Rev. Karl J. Alter summarized the procedure and findings of the National Study of Catholic Child Caring Homes. This study covered the best points in the methods and procedure of one hundred selected children's institutions. A clear distinction was drawn between the procedure followed in this study and that ordinarily adopted in a survey. The complete findings are soon to be published as a practical manual for child caring homes.

The newer trends in habit training of pre-school children were outlined by Dr. Douglas A. Thom. His great experience in this field and his sound judgment on the possibilities of work with pre-school children were evident in his very thorough treatment of the subject.

Many constructive suggestions were presented by Miss Maud Morlock of Western Reserve University for "Putting the Findings of Child Welfare Research Into the Practice of Social Agencies". The executive and supervisors must shoulder a large share of responsibility for engendering a spirit of research in the agency and in its workers. Even a small agency can contribute to child welfare progress if its workers make proper use of scientific literature, organize projects for their own study, and take advantage of the institutes and courses given by recognized schools.

DIVISION II—DELINQUENTS AND CORRECTION

George W. Kirchwey, Chairman

The city of Boston furnished a congenial and inspiring atmosphere for the meetings of our division of the Conference. The community which led the American people in the movement for the abolition of negro slavery had already, half a century earlier, waged war against the twin evil of prison slavery, and before and beyond any other community organized and applied probation and the mental study of the delinquent in the juvenile court and in the jail and was even now, still in the van of penal progress,

working out the problem of the individual treatment of the offender in the prison and after. The members of the Division of Delinquents and Correction found themselves at home in Zion.

The program of the division was concerned not so much with causes of delinquency or with the aims of the correctional process but rather with the techniques employed and the estimation of their values, that is, of their success or failure and the reasons therefor. As a setting for this inquiry the program was organized in the main about two outstanding events, the recent Harvard Law School survey of criminal justice in the Boston district and the recent tragic revelation of prison conditions in the United States.

Unluckily, the Boston Survey had not reached the point where its results could be put before the public at this conference and it was found necessary to substitute other material at the two sessions which had been allotted to this phase of the program. At the first meeting, however, Professor Felix Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School, spoke on the subject, *New Light on Criminal Justice*, picturing the shift from the old to the new, from the legal to the social conception of the aims and methods of penal administration—all of which was taken by his audience as an earnest of the social character of the survey which he has directed, and of the report which he is now preparing.

That the police, too, have a function in social work was the burden of Miss Virginia Murray's paper on the Bureau of Crime Prevention of the police department of New York City, recently organized and now directed by her.

The second session of the Division was devoted to a careful, analytical study of the Juvenile Court and Probation, the opening paper being presented by Frederick A. Moran, for many years Commissioner of Probation of the State of New York and now director of the Catholic Protectorate of New York City. He was followed by Miss Jessie Binford of Chicago, who summarized the tragic history of the Juvenile Court and Reformatory product who tells his story in Clifford Shaw's book, *"The Jack-Roller"*.

The third session of the Division was a joint meeting with Division X, The Immigrant, and was devoted to the subject of Nationality as a factor in Delinquency. The usual statistical approach to the subject was avoided and attention concentrated on the problem of the alien exposed to diverse social conditions in a new world. Dr. Edith Abbott in a Survey of our National Attitudes presented a vivid picture of the earlier tides of immigration and of our national response to them, and was followed by Mr. Clifford R. Shaw with his careful study of the effect of the movement of alien groups into and out of certain delinquency areas in Chicago. Professor Max S. Handman of the

University of Texas concluded the discussion with a picturesque description of the Mexican immigrant making his sometimes painful adjustment to the folk-ways of the American southwest.

In its fourth session our Division swung into the second phase of its program, the treatment of the criminal offender. The Chairman of the Division, taking as his topic *"The Swing of the Pendulum"*, discussed the successive phases of penal policy during the last two centuries and especially the recent slump into barbarism of public sentiment in this country as evidenced by abnormal sentences and present prison conditions. The Vision of the Future, a future governed by a new understanding of human nature, was then presented by Dr. A. Warren Stearns, Commissioner of the State Department of Correction of Massachusetts, and the picture painted by him was further elaborated in discussion by Frank Loveland, Jr., of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and by Dr. Sheldon Glueck of the Harvard Law School.

The fifth and last session of the Division was devoted to *The Prison in the Twentieth Century*; Dr. Walter N. Thayer, Jr., the new Commissioner of Correction of the State of New York, speaking on *Prison Tendencies in the United States* and Mr. Thorsten Sellin, of the University of Pennsylvania, on *Prison Tendencies in Europe*. Mr. Sellin described the new prison policies recently adopted in Germany and several other European countries, while Dr. Thayer outlined a strikingly progressive program of differentiated treatment for the various types of offenders committed to prison. The discussion was concluded by a challenging paper by Ralph Van Waters of Chicago, giving the results of the psychological study of prisoners in Illinois prisons, and characterizing the feebleness and ineffectiveness of the present procedures as a guide to the classification and treatment of prisoners.

DIVISION III—HEALTH

Ira V. Hiscock, M. D., Chairman

Nationally recognized speakers, unusually large audiences and stimulating discussions characterized the meetings of the Health Division in 1930. Of the four regular sessions, two were held jointly with other Divisions of the Conference on Health Division time, in addition to two joint sessions on the time of other Divisions. One morning, in addition, was devoted to a series of five group discussions, four of which were joint sessions. This plan of joint sessions proved highly satisfactory and is to be recommended for future meetings. The total attendance at the Health Division meetings, including two luncheons primarily for health division members, was approximately 1,600. Three of the five group discussions were attended by over 200 persons each, and the formal sessions were each attended by over 150 persons.

In the preparation of the program, excellent cooperation was received from many local, state, and national health and welfare organizations, as well as from the office of the National Conference of Social Work. Program planning was undertaken by the Division committee at the close of the San Francisco meeting and was continued fairly actively until the final program was in order some months before the annual meeting. In spite of the early completion of the program, it was only necessary to make one change in a major speaker. Although Division committee cooperation in planning was obtained by correspondence, it is believed that at least one Division committee meeting might practically have been held in New York during the year. Such committee meetings would be stimulating and generally helpful.

To promote the publicity work of the Conference, the Chairman, one month prior to the meeting, circularized all State Health Officers in New England and New York State, together with health officers in New England cities of 50,000 population or over, and many visiting nurse associations.

On Monday morning, June 9, the Health Division, in joint session with Division XII, Educational Publicity, and the Social Work Publicity Council, gave consideration to Clinics as Centers of Health Education. Dr. Iago Galdston of the New York Academy of Medicine discussed the basis and significance of health education in clinics, Mr. Evart G. Routzahn of the Russell Sage Foundation discussed the preparation and use of posters, exhibits and literature and directed attention to the wealth of material at publicity headquarters, and Miss Frances Stern and her associates of the Boston Dispensary gave a demonstration of education in regard to nutrition in clinics. Attendance 150.

Five group discussions, functioning at the same time, occupied Tuesday morning.

A joint session with The Family Division, to consider Minimum Health Knowledge and Professional Attitudes on Health Problems was presided over by Howard Green of the Cleveland Health Council, with an attendance of 250. Miss Antoinette Cannon of the New York School of Social Work and Virginia Wing of the Cleveland Anti-Tuberculosis League were discussion leaders. The question was considered frankly, and it is believed that a similar topic would be worthy of further discussion by health and social workers another year, because of the need for mutual understanding of these problems. Considerable attention has been recently given to the nature of public health courses which are given in schools of social work, and to the minimum health knowledge which social workers should possess. In turn, the public health worker needs to understand the social worker's point of view and the relationship of social work and public health.

Mrs. James F. Norris of Boston presided over a joint session with the American Federation of Organizations for the Hard of Hearing, which considered problems of education, medical service, and the hard of hearing child.

The timely subject of the care of chronic diseases was presented to the Health Division on Wednesday morning by outstanding leaders in the field. Attendance 250. Miss Ida Cannon effectively discussed the Utilization of Resources of the Chronic Sick, emphasizing the importance of the proper psychological approach and consideration of the human relations factors, as well as the extent of institutionalization necessary or desirable. Dr. H. L. Lombard outlined the results of extensive studies of the problem of chronic diseases in Massachusetts, and Dr. George Bigelow, State Commissioner of Health effectively presented the State Cancer Control Program and the results to date.

The morning of June 13, was devoted to a consideration of the problems of Social Work Planning Through Surveys and Appraisals, in joint session with Division VIII, Organization of Social Forces. Attendance 200 plus. Dr. C. E. A. Winslow presented an interesting paper on the health survey as a social instrument, and this was followed by a paper on the Appraisal of Health Work, by Dr. Huntington Williams, with discussion by Mr. George Hamilton of Honolulu, Mr. Bleecker Marquette of Cincinnati, and Mr. Robert Kelso of St. Louis, among others.

There has been a rapid development in the United States during the past ten years in the use of health and welfare surveys as a social instrument and as a basis of evaluation and sound program planning. On the basis of studies made by the United States Public Health Service and the American Public Health Association, in over 200 cities, standards of health practice have been developed. The interpretation of the survey results to the community was an important problem considered by Division VIII.

The final session on Race Improvement and the Health Field proved popular, with papers on What We Know about Heredity and Environment, by Dr. Benjamin C. Gruenberg, New York City, and What Is Practical in Race Improvement, by Dr. T. Wingate Todd of Cleveland. Dr. William Healy of the Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, led the discussion.

In addition to the formal sessions, two luncheon meetings were held during the week; one on Housing and the second for Executives of Health Councils. Reconditioning Slum Areas was the topic of the Housing Symposium Luncheon, at which Mr. John Ihlder of Pittsburgh presided. The subject was presented from the social worker's point of view by Mr. Lawson Purdy of New York; from the realtor's point of view by Mr. William C. Codman of Boston; from the city planner's point of view by Mr. Arthur A. Shurtleff of Boston, and from the

point of view of public health by Hon. Royal S. Copeland, of Washington, D. C.

The Executives of Health Councils held an interesting luncheon, during which the work in this field was discussed by various health council representatives from cities throughout the United States.

DIVISION IV—THE FAMILY

Paul L. Benjamin, Chairman

The Family Division program ran a wide gamut of subjects designed to whet the interests of board member, volunteer, layman and professional worker alike.

One of the unique features of the Division this year was an experiment with the round tables. Ten round tables were held with a discussion leader each on five different subjects. With the exception of one or two round tables, they were limited to an attendance of fifty people each. Tickets were printed in advance and were distributed at the Conference desk. People who attended the various round tables have said that the restriction in numbers meant instead of a mob, a select group which lent itself to actual discussion with opportunity for presentation of difficult problems confronting widely separated communities. One round table on "Unemployment" under the chairmanship of John Sanderson of Rochester, which was thrown open to the public, had about four hundred people in attendance. Mr. Sanderson had worked out an excellent program with a summing up by Paul U. Kellogg, editor of *The Survey*. Although this departed somewhat from the group discussion idea, the session was of great interest and of unquestioned value.

Miss Joanna C. Colcord in her discussion of "Strengths in Family Life" gave an exhilarating paper lighted up with humor, phrased in simple but poetic language and illustrated with quotations from letters of a sea captain which gave it a tinge of the sea and sea faring folk. She stressed the remarkable cohesiveness which resides in many otherwise disadvantaged families. She stated: "No doubt domestic discord among people with narrow opportunities and little money to cushion shocks is all the more discordant when it does occur, but on the other hand, is it not true in our experience that we often find, among the families that come to us as victims of economic distress, more adequate nurseries of childhood than we can easily match with examples drawn from among our friends on a higher economic level? Homes where there are enough children to take over from the parents part of the duties of tending and disciplining each other, do seem to produce more stable children than the most anxious parental cosetting. Homes where both parents are too busy at useful tasks to interfere unnecessarily in the children's development secure better-developed children. Homes where children necessarily and as a matter of course participate in the work of the house-

hold send them forth better equipped for useful lives. Homes where care and frugality have to be displayed in expending the family income do not so often produce in the children habits of selfishness and extravagance."

In conclusion Miss Colcord quoted from Havelock Ellis, who says that founding a family is always an adventure, "... life must always be full of risks. We may smile, therefore, when it is remarked that the future developments of the home are risky. Birds in the air and fishes in the sea, quite as much as our own ancestors on the earth, have always found life full of risks. It was the greatest risk of all when they insisted on continuing on the old outworn ways and so became extinct. If the home is an experiment, one can only say that life is always like that."

Mrs. Howard Knight, the wife of the secretary of the National Conference, in discussing an experiment in Parental Education with a large number of mothers in Columbus, Ohio, gave a little gem of a paper—concrete, human and of wide practicable application.

Mr. Linton B. Swift, of the Family Welfare Association of America, and Mr. Robert W. Kelso, of the Community Fund of St. Louis, laid out a hearty bill of fare.

Mr. Swift raised a question which had its repercussions through the entire Conference: "I should like to see the community fund and its member agencies freed for a more adequate and better balanced approach to social program, and for concentration in the community fund campaign upon the interpretation and support of that program. I should like to see the chest and the case work-relief agencies freed from any direct or implied responsibility for the relief needs of the whole community. And I wish to raise a question as to whether this cannot be best accomplished by confining our general community appeal to support for service programs, eliminating the wholesale relief appeal as far as possible, and substituting other methods of raising relief funds as needed throughout the year."

Mr. Kelso presented figures showing the staggering sums of money being raised by community chests in the United States. For example, the budgets of thirty community chests during the year 1929 totalled \$26,374,286.22; of this amount, the chests contributed \$14,147,190.25. He presented a forwardlooking definition for the Community Chest: "A Community Chest is the present day demand of modern city life for a more coherent defense system against social ills."

At the end of his paper Mr. Kelso declared that the purpose of his paper was "that the evolution of sound individual case work in outdoor relief, is the strongest guarantee for the success of the Community Chest movement; that it is an essential part of that movement, and can in no wise be separated from it; and finally, that by requiring as the Chest movement

does, that family relief service be intimately related to every other phase of social work in its daily operation, our profession of social work shall make certain of the well-rounded growth of our social work program of the future."

In a joint meeting held with the Industrial Problems Committee of the Family Welfare Association of America and Division V, the field of industry as it touches family social work was tackled by two outstanding speakers in the field of industry, namely, Miss Charlotte Carr, Industrial Consultant of the New York Charity Organization Society, and Prof. A. J. Muste of Brookwood Labor College. Miss Carr stated that an analysis of case records has persuaded her that the trained case worker has a real contribution to make to industry. The technique of investigation used in case work, she said, is a tremendous contribution. The case worker helps in an unemployment situation by advising the unemployed about jobs, by staking them to employment fees, by serving as a mediator between the employer and the client, by paying union dues, by getting tools out of pawn and most of all when "she builds up his spirit, demoralized by months of discouraging job searching."

Miss Carr urged that family welfare societies give to the public the fullest possible facts as to social and industrial conditions. "The family societies were pioneers in the field of tenement house reform. In many quarters they were active leaders in the bringing about of widows' pensions. The old age pension, recently made law in New York, not only had the backing of family agencies, but was passed in great measure as a result of facts obtained from the records of these agencies." She raised the question whether or not family case workers have been too much influenced by mental hygiene and too little cognizant of industrial factors. She answered it by saying, "Effective mental hygiene requires a knowledge of the work life as well as of the other activities and human relationships of the client."

Mr. Muste urged labor representation on committees and board of family societies. He said, "The people who are the 'cases' for our family societies are in the vast majority of instances working-class people. If, therefore, the family society is to be in fact and not merely in name a community or communal enterprise, and not an agency by which one class in the community does something to another class, if it is to be an agency for working with and not for working on people, if it is to stand for social service and not for charity, it seems essential that the point of view of those who represent a large percentage of the population and probably a still larger percentage of the people actually dealt with by the society, should be adequately represented."

In the concluding session, Miss Mary P. Wheeler, general secretary

of the United Charities of St. Paul, discussed "Social Values which Underlie the Selection of Cases". Miss Wheeler's paper was based upon the exhaustive analysis of questionnaires sent to forty states. The questionnaires revealed, she said, that private funds alone will not be sufficient to foot the relief bill. She outlined the social values underlying the selection of cases.

Unfortunately, Mr. Emil G. Steger, of the St. Louis Provident Association, was unable to be present. The points in his paper were ably presented by Miss Nadia Thomas, one of his associates. He finds that the increase and demand on case working agencies coupled with the shortage of funds has created a pressure dangerous to the very purpose of the family society. He states: "Social case work, like any other professional healing activity, is in itself a recognition of an abnormal condition in family life. The activity of the social case-worker, though necessary under the circumstances, is an interference in social relationships. Such interference is justified only when and as long as it may be absolutely necessary. Social case-work dare never over-step the boundaries of needed professional service, for the cost of such over-stepping is inevitably the weakening of personal and family strength—the defeat of the end purpose of professional service."

DIVISION V—INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Reverend Frederic Siedenburg,
Chairman

"The Conference has gone economic" was a phrase often heard towards the end of the Conference and it almost became a slogan. The reason was the large attendance that nearly filled Huntington Hall of the M. I. T. Architectural School. The Division on Industrial and Economic Problems had at last come into its own, for in the past it did not receive the attention it deserved. Often only a corporal's guard did honor to the basic considerations of social work propounded and discussed by the best minds of the land. Many who did not or could not attend the meetings, expressed their satisfaction that many now are seeking ultimate causes of social conditions, instead of being satisfied with the changing modes of partial phenomena and their equally partial panaceas. The stimulus for this economic interest may be found in the current economic depression and its consequent unemployment, especially of the aged.

The meetings opened with a review of Justice Brandeis' remembered address at the last Boston Conference, nineteen years ago. Paul U. Kellogg of the Survey, who had heard the Brandeis' address, was discussion leader and gave a graphic account of the man and his theme. The three speakers, Paul Douglas, John B. Andrews and Alice H. Grady, all

stressed the progress made in two decades of industrial insurance from three different angles, stressing particularly the contributions from shorter working days, workingmen's compensation laws, industrial life insurance, especially of the "cash and carry" variety, now conducted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The problems of the southern textile industry were discussed by representatives of labor, the employer, the social worker and the church, and in spite of pronounced differences of opinion there was a general unanimity that in the absence of an organized political community, the mill town was inevitable and a necessary evil, in order to transform the raw mountaineer into an industrial worker. They also agreed that the southern mountaineer is quick to learn the ways and thoughts of his northern brother whose longer experience has taught him the benefits of organization and bargaining. It was also realized that the most present disturbing factor in the southern textile problem is the colored worker who still waits for industrial emancipation.

The session on Current Problems of Unemployment was particularly timely and remedies were proposed by Agnes Nestor of the National Women's Trade Union League, by Ernest G. Draper of the Hills Brothers Company, by Charlotte E. Carr of the Charity Organization Society of New York City, and by Sophonisba Breckinridge of the University of Chicago. Here was a symposium on the contribution of labor, the employer, the community and the schools. All the speakers agreed that the present situation is serious, made doubly so by its international character. Attention was focused upon the unique experiment of Russia, the doles of other European nations, and the Wagner bills now before our Congress for better employment statistics and a federal employment bureau. Far reaching solutions were proposed in every kind of social insurance, more selective immigration and even its absolute cessation. Nevertheless progress was reported, and yet all concurred that like the poor, unemployment will always be with us unless drastic means be taken to change our present economic system.

The discussion of Economic Old Age was inevitable and the changes were rung on overproduction, the mechanization of industry, and the industrial derelict whose only crime is age. Caroline Manning of the U. S. Woman's Bureau startled the assembly by examples of persons, principally women, discharged because they had reached the superannuated age of twenty-five. This was explained by the fact that many machines require for operation little experience and less intelligence, and that an eighteen or twenty-year-old girl can be had at a lower wage and yet do the job satisfactorily. But the fundamental arguments pro and con

for old age pensions were brought to the surface by Noel Sargent of the National Association of Manufacturers and Abraham Epstein of the American Association of Old Age Security. A veritable debate was held, enjoyed by the audience, who went away with a comprehensive grasp of the problems involved.

The last meeting concerned itself with recent measures to prevent industrial conflict. Legal injunctions were discussed by Francis T. Sayre of the Harvard Law School, Arbitration and Conciliation by John J. Sonstebly of the United Garment Workers, and Social Legislation by Frances Perkins of the Department of Labor of New York State. All the speakers realized the defects of our industrial system, but in view of the progress of the past, all predicted a continuation of the same without resort to so-called radical programs. Like the past, the future will demand a shifting of ideas and procedures, producing revolutions by the slower processes of reform.

Three of the sessions were held jointly with the American Association of Labor Legislation, and one in conjunction with the Family Division which discussed Economic Factors in Case Work. The papers and discussions were generally appreciated as was evidenced by frequent and loud applause and the conspicuous absence of "Conference shoppers".

DIVISION VI—NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY LIFE

Mrs. Robert A. Woods, Chairman

The attendance and discussions of Neighborhood and Community Life gave evidence of the vitality of the interest in the phases of social work included in this broad field. Both the philosophy of conscious direction of social forces and the techniques involved were taken into consideration.

A much anticipated address by Dr. John Lovejoy Elliott had to be foregone because of Dr. Elliott's inability to be present. It fell, therefore to Mr. LeRoy Bowman to open the sessions with a definition of social integration which he declared the power of personality to draw men together into a sense of social relationships drawing forth their capacities for effective social action. He gave the absent John Elliott as a significant example of a man with this practical power to develop a social environment.

Mr. Bellamy's paper brought the discussion into the realm of methods whereby the resources of society are carried into the surrounding life of the individual and the family becomes integrated thereby into the going currents of advancing social well being.

The family visitor who has the quality and technique to be both friend and advisor thus becomes an essential member of the settlement staff.

Along with such expert service it is the constant business of the

settlement to be finding out the laws which govern the process of social growth, the effects of environment on man, the functioning and feeling together and the resulting humility.

Miss Mary McDowell followed with her characteristic illumination and sympathetic interpretation of the experiences which she has gained from living with the sequence of races that have passed through the Chicago stock yards district, "The Pageantry of Nationality". She spoke of the importance of continuity in family life as between the immigrant parent and the child of the new country. The conflict which arises at times is that of the old country culture of generations versus the upstart. Culture, she pointed out, is a matter of continuous growth—you cannot cut off the branch of a tree to make a fresh start. The parents may not be safely ignored, they may be "most illiterate but most intelligent".

The discussion resolved itself chiefly around this phase of social integration with valuable suggestions out of experience, as, that quick and forced assimilation of Jewish young people had been a mistake—they needed the integration with their own racial group—a synthesis in the life of the Jew on the basis of his racial heritage that they might be first true to themselves and so able to make a worthwhile contribution to the life of the United States. The problem of the exiled, educated Russian mother was presented as that of a desire and responsibility to pass on to her children the culture of their racial inheritance as being in certain respects superior to current American ways of thought and behavior, certainly of greater intrinsic value.

The separation of parents from the interests of their children is a misfortune and sometimes occurs through the settlement program. Practical ways of involving the home in building up a neighborhood sense and useful avocations and interests were suggested.

It was a natural transition from this discussion to that of the session on housing treated both technically and vividly as an essential factor in social environment. The story of the new community at Radburn, New Jersey, showed the social thought of the builder finding unique and practical ways of building around the life of the family with young children.

The papers on Unemployment likewise indicated the effect of social mindedness in developing community action in dealing with a local share of this world-wide problem and brought the subject out of the realm of generalizations into the actual poignant human story.

The group of discussion meetings developed lively and suggestive exchanges of problem and experience and helped to indicate some matters that should go into the Division VI programs of the future. One point in particular that this division should clarify concerns the uses of certain terms and adequate definitions for the

better understanding of Social Workers among themselves. Notably this need is felt in regard to the word "Community" itself, that it should be given a comprehensive social workers' meaning.

That the unfolding of human power is the essential aim of social work as the basis of practical endeavor was the final expression of the last Division meeting. This program like the opening one was significant as the expression of leaders who have helped from the pioneering days both to shape the way and to develop a sound philosophy. The Place of the Arts in the Settlement Program in giving outlet and opportunity to the varied capacities and interests of people, whether in the formation of individual character or because of social values in a common objective interest of high quality in which neighbors may participate is of the essence of good social work.

DIVISION VII—MENTAL HYGIENE

Henry C. Schumacher, Chairman

The mental hygiene division did not exist at the previous meeting of the Conference in Boston. Today mental hygiene not only ranks as a division of the Conference but the programs of many other divisions have, as one speaker at the recent meeting expressed it, "gone psychiatric".

This year's program aimed at taking stock of previous work and of presenting the most recent advances in this field. The papers on social psychiatric problems of state hospitals and of clinics were in the nature of stock taking. Both speakers discussed historically the work of the psychiatrist and the psychiatric worker in hospital and clinic and pointed out the unsolved problems in these fields.

Dr. C. Macfie Campbell, of Boston, who talked on "Social Psychiatric Problems in Hospitals" recalled that in former days one might talk of the psychiatric social worker as playing the role of guide, philosopher and friend.

"A more sophisticated age", he declared, "boggles at the authority of the guide, scents evasion in the attitude of the philosopher and scrutinizes in detail the complicated libidinous and regressive attachments involved in the role of friend. The psychiatric social worker now walks more warily and in fuller consciousness of the issues involved."

In discussing "Social Psychiatric Problems in Clinics", Dr. Gerald H. G. Pearson, of Philadelphia, stated that the problem which gets the individual into difficulties is not the real problem, but only a symptom. "The inability to adjust is internal", he said. "The symptoms, whether of delinquency or dependency are for the individual the solution of his problem. As such they are more satisfying because they are more comfortable than reality and he does not want to give them up. Always the worker must re-

main absolutely neutral. The patient will attempt constantly to force him to side with him against the rest of the situation, and may paint it in such lurid colors that the ordinary listener would invariably take sides. This is done in an effort to excuse himself for not doing any more about it himself. But to take sides blocks future progress. The inner conflicts which are the real causes of poorly-adjusted behavior are to be resolved by an attitude of interested listening to develop in the patient the voluntary attempt to discover the reason for his difficulties."

That mental hygiene is not limited to any one phase of social work was evidenced in the joint meeting with the divisions on Children, Family, and Delinquency and Correction. These joint meetings tended to emphasize the above quoted expression that social work has "gone psychiatric".

The joint meeting with the division on Delinquency and Correction had as its topic, "The Psychiatrist's Contribution in the Treatment of Prisoners". The interest of the psychiatrist in criminology is looked upon with considerable concern by many. However, had these same individuals listened to Drs. Stearns and Kirchwey in their discussion of this topic many indeed would have come to a new realization of the advances in this field of criminology.

Dr. Stearns concluded his paper as follows:

"Psychiatrists have made and will continue to make important contributions to the field of criminology, but in a broader sense I believe the problem of crime to be a social problem, necessitating aid from a number of disciplines of which psychiatry is but one. It is a problem for science, and the great problem before all of us is to replace the cut and dried formulae upon which criminal procedure now rests with the data of science. It makes little difference whether the individuals using the scientific method are psychiatrists, educators, social workers, or intelligent wise persons wherever they may be found."

That psychology and economics may "go" hand in hand was evidenced by a splendid paper on "The Integration of Economic and Psychological Factors in Social Case Work." Here by the use of case material and philosophical discussion Miss Neustaedter showed among other points, the relationship between emotional and financial security and how to balance one against the other.

"The psycho-analytic approach to human conduct in the administering of relief is essential", Miss Neustaedter declared, "not only because of the difficulty of making relief constructive for the recipient, but because cases of economic insufficiency frequently present problems of extreme complexity involving subtle psychiatric issues and a net work of human relationships in which we find our services requested not because the problem is complex but because it has

a financial aspect which we who have access to a relief budget are in a position to handle. In such cases relief is a key which opens to the case worker a door of opportunity for usefulness."

An interesting joint meeting was held with the American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers at which a four hundred page case record was summarized by the psychiatric social worker and discussed by representatives of the different fields involved in the handling of the case, such as the family case worker, the psychiatrist, the church worker, the children's and the psychiatric social worker. The varieties of initial approach by the various fields represented in the discussion, were characterized by Mr. de Schweinitz as the "my" problem for the analyst, the "his" or "her" problem for the children's worker, later becoming the "our" problem, and the "it" problem for the family case worker. This hinges on a note brought out at another meeting, namely, the value of dealing with the present situation adequately as well as finding the cause of the difficulty and treating it.

Certain topics such as Mental Hygiene in Industry, Mental Hygiene in Public Health Nursing Organizations, Food and Mental Hygiene, never before discussed at meetings of the division, had a place on the program. Round table discussion meetings at which these topics were presented were well attended and elicited much discussion. These discussion meetings were important contributions to the program of the division.

DIVISION VIII—ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL FORCES

David H. Holbrook, Chairman

This year's program carried on the Memphis theme (program-making through fact finding, discussion and voluntary agreement) into the problems involved in social surveys. It raised the question, "How can all the social forces for progress in a community (including those less amenable to formal social processes of community planning) be made to serve their common purpose?" Two other types of social organization—women's movements and organized labor—added their challenges in the widening partnership in community upbuilding that has been recognized by Division VIII since the Des Moines Conference in 1925.

The community survey movement of fifteen years ago grew out of similar needs in an earlier situation. National leadership, notably through the Russell Sage Foundation, resulted in much general education on the subject. The best evidence of the quality of that leadership is found in the wide sharing of survey methods and procedures that resulted. That which was done laboriously and with great difficulty by a few experts has become a part of the professional equipment of many social workers.

In opening the discussion of this subject the presiding officer, Mr. Shelby M. Harrison, who has been a leader throughout this period, pointed out the three fundamental processes that have been present throughout—(1) fact gathering, (2) interpretation, and (3) presentation. It is known that over 2700 surveys have been made during this period. Other fields are making use of these methods, such as city planners, sociologists, etc. The increased interest in fact finding, research and wholesale scrutinizing in the industrial, religious, educational and social work fields has been accompanied by a refinement of processes and has resulted in more effective and economical methods.

The papers by Neva R. Deardorff, Director of Research Bureau, Welfare Council of New York City, and Ruth Hill, Associate Executive Secretary, Family Welfare Association of America, brought out the broad distinctions between the approaches of the sociologist and the social worker. Although these differ, the use of methods and material is much the same. Neither is better or worse than the other. Dr. Deardorff pointed out that what is actually known about social science is very limited, but what is thought by social scientists fills volumes. The content, however, is not clear. Her analysis of the values for the social worker in the more recent sociological types of community study was devoted largely to the "Chicago Studies" and included critical as well as appreciative comments. "Social workers," she said, "will be most interested in the field studies made by universities rather than in the discussion of abstract sociological principles." She treated sociologists and social workers as partners having mutual contributions to make rather than as rivals for leadership, either past or present. She pleaded for more "sociological insight" in the relations between the universities and social agencies.

In general her paper was an answer to recent statements that social workers have abdicated their leadership to social scientists.

Miss Hill offered some much needed definitions implied in the very general term survey. She pointed out four kinds: (1) the general but intensive survey, which examines all the social aspects of life in a given area and recommends next steps and developments; (2) the pathfinding survey, which examines extensively in order to suggest where next to concentrate for active work. It is the shorter study process and one suitable to a fairly undeveloped community; (3) the intensive but partial survey, such as housing, certain aspects of health, the homeless, including suggestions as to improvements; (4) the agency survey or study of one administrative unit in one of the functional divisions, for example a Travelers Aid Society study.

Exaggerated expectations of what can be expected Now have been de-

cidedly reduced from experience to some very simple but helpful objectives. "A few samplings from the store are wanted, not just what can be garnered together suddenly in summaries." What is at the heart of a program; what is to be done next; direction pointing; discovery of inherent strengths in community living; the opening up of new vistas; and more infusion of the normal aspects of living," are some of the essential purposes in a survey.

Miss Hill's paper included a valuable list of "survey principles restated," and described the social survey "not only as a measuring stick but also as a divining rod which may be used to show where the living waters of creative social leadership are to be found and how they are to be tapped."

One session was devoted to the presentation of concrete material bringing out new experiments and improvements in the art of surveying. Miss Edith Foster, Associate Secretary, Wisconsin Conference of Social Work, described the work affecting 125 Wisconsin cities where social consciousness has been stimulated through community self-examination. A wider knowledge among informed citizens on (1) structural set-up of the community, and (2) minimum standards to be expected of public and private agencies was the given objective. This precluded any attempt at scientific accuracy but aimed at arousing the public conscience.

Bradley Buell, Director, New Orleans Community Chest, showed the importance of local budget processes in revealing specific needs for study and securing prompt administrative action on recommendations. He reported action taken on thirty-five out of forty-nine major recommendations made during the past five years. Help from outside, he thought, was needed (1) for expert technical advice, and (2) to secure the prestige and organization experience of a national organization.

Mary Irene Atkinson showed the experience of the Child Welfare League of America in seeking economy of resources through including demonstration as a part of the survey process. She described several plans that had been adapted to certain local situations where a specially qualified worker assumed an administrative responsibility as she studied the local needs.

The general public and the leadership it requires was a theme that brought forth two interesting and somewhat novel suggestions. In discussing the interpretation of social surveys Pierce Atwater, Secretary of the St. Paul Community Chest, described in detail a Social Problems Index as a means of recording, checking and following up recommendations from surveys and informal studies. He also outlined specifically and with illustrations the step-by-step post-survey process that is necessary to capitalize the earlier study process and secure action. His paper

emphasized the importance of some working machinery as well as inspirational personal skill and wise methods.

In discussing the final question of leadership that must follow social planning George Warren, Director of the International Migration Service, New York City, made an exceedingly helpful contribution by his distinction between the direct official and administrative type of leadership that is well known in a community, and the indirect, educational and stimulating influence of key people motivated mainly by interest in a particular need. From an analysis of twenty-five names listed by him as indirect leaders in a certain community he discovered that in each instance the contribution had been confined pretty largely to one interest. Certain studies of leadership in special groups made by the University of Chicago (students, prison inmates and a civil service group) further confirmed his general conclusion that leadership essentially is specific and not general. From this he argued that the recruiting of influential volunteer leadership should be accompanied by careful analyses of situations involving needs. He pointed this out as a great challenge to community chest and council of social agencies executives.

Taken as a whole the program emphasized the increasing interest in careful study and planning for effective social work. It revealed new friends and allies. It showed that the developmental and educational work of the earlier leaders in the survey movement had been so well done that the pupils are now hurling back at their teachers some of the very things they tried so hard to teach and in improved form. Leaders both old and new have kept alert and are refining their own methods. A survey may be useful or wasteful to the extent that it is undertaken in the light of this knowledge.

DIVISION IX—PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND ADMINISTRATION

Richard K. Conant, Chairman

More public officials than have registered in recent years attended the sessions of Division IX. In response to a request from Governor Allen of Massachusetts, the Governors of nearly all the states appointed official delegates.

The Division voted to approve the organization of, and there was organized at a luncheon meeting, the American Association of Public Welfare Officials. This association will provide the machinery for further building up the interest of public officials in the National Conference and will hold its meetings at the time of the Conference. Leroy A. Halbert, Director of State Institutions of Rhode Island, was elected President of the association. The association will distribute information of interest to state Departments of Public Welfare and will look forward to voicing the

opinion of state departments on such matters as uniform social statistics, uniform settlement laws, qualifications of employees and such matters, carrying on the studies which may be found necessary to secure joint action.

The first session of Division IX was devoted to Federal Bureaus and their relation to State Departments. Many of these bureaus were merely mentioned. Their relationships to state departments might well be studied further; for example, the Census Bureau, the Bureau of Immigration, the Public Health Service and the Bureau of Standards. The only one comprehensively discussed this year was the Children's Bureau. Miss Katherine F. Lenroot, Assistant Chief of the Children's Bureau, described its services to state departments, its informational service about state and local organizations for child welfare, its bulletins and exhibit material and its child welfare news summary. It is working on a plan for the development of nation-wide juvenile court statistics. It holds periodic conferences of executives of state departments in regard to child welfare; it conducts institutes for workers in specialized fields and provides consultation service in regard to surveys. It has developed a department of legal research in regard to legislation, which is available for state departments. It makes field studies of the organization and administrative methods of state departments and field studies of the problems of delinquency and dependency at the request of state departments. Miss Lenroot hoped that the Bureau might, at the request of a state department, carry on an actual demonstration of the possibility of the development of local resources for child welfare.

The second session was devoted to interesting resumé of the year's legislative and administrative developments by C. C. Carstens, Director of the Child Welfare League of America, and John A. Brown, Secretary of the Indiana Board of State Charities. These were considered of sufficient importance that the Division voted to ask that the papers be printed in time to use with the 1931 sessions of the legislatures.

The most largely attended session was that on old age assistance. California, New York and Massachusetts have enacted state-wide laws requiring local units to grant old age assistance under state supervision and with state reimbursement. It was not possible to have the California system described at this Conference, but the New York and Massachusetts plans were described, respectively by Charles H. Johnson, Director of the New York Department, and Richard K. Conant, Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department. The plans are essentially extensions of the existing relief systems. New administrative units are not created. A liberal extension of relief to aged persons whose families are unable to support them is the essential feature of the new laws. The plan is in direct opposition to the pension

scheme with its tendency toward giving a fixed amount as a dole, irrespective of need or family responsibility.

The Massachusetts law, which is typical of the three, provides for adequate assistance to citizens seventy years of age or over who are in need. This assistance is to be given by city or town boards of public welfare under the supervision of the State Department of Public Welfare. The state will reimburse one-third of the cost in settled cases and the whole cost in unsettled cases. Children will be required to support their parents if they are able. The theory of the law is to enforce family responsibility and not to substitute the state for the family. No new boards are set up, although the boards are to create divisions of old age assistance within their present organizations. The underlying principles of the measure are adequate assistance at home, individualized treatment of each case, and local administration with state supervision. In the discussion, some speakers, chiefly from New York, questioned the wisdom of placing this responsibility so quickly upon local boards of public welfare.

Another new development in the field of public welfare administration was presented at the fourth session by Miss H. Ida Curry, of the New York Charities Aid Association, who spoke upon the development of county or town boards. Minnesota and North Carolina represent states which in 1917 provided for county boards of welfare to assist the state board in carrying out its obligations within the county. In Minnesota the State Board, in addition to the supervisory and inspectorial duties usually developing upon such boards, assumes through a State Children's Bureau guardianship of and responsibility for protecting children born out of wedlock, for the feeble-minded committed to it, and for children locally and erroneously termed 'unplaceable'. The State Children's Bureau depends upon its county boards to look after its wards, frequently through the volunteer service of board members. The state also assigns to county boards duties relating to free home placements, licensing boarding homes, approving legal adoptions, etc. In North Carolina the State Board of Charities and Public Welfare carries no such responsibility. Such responsibility remains a county function. Provision is made for a County Superintendent of Public Welfare. The North Carolina State Board appoints three members of the county welfare boards and has complete control over them. In both Minnesota and North Carolina the state assigns duties to the local boards. Miss Curry felt that on the whole the county seems the most practicable unit for welfare administration, at least in the case work field. The state, she believes, is too far removed to be effective in handling difficulties for which services should be immediately available. The board should interpret the need for social work in its methods, should educate public opinion, should study state and

local needs, should compare methods with those effected elsewhere, should prevent political domination and political bias from jeopardizing the social work and should influence the selection of well qualified social workers when appointments are to be made. In conclusion, Miss Curry said that whether a board can be most useful if composed of officials, or of citizens or of both; whether it should be an adjunct of state government or of local government; whether it shall be given case work responsibilities, either with or without paid service, and what territory it can best serve in view of its functions appear to be the outstanding questions which the present development of boards of welfare present to us for consideration.

The round tables were on specialized topics: (1) Uniform Social Statistics, Emil Frankel, Director of Research of the New Jersey State Department Institutions and Agencies; (2) Modern Care of the Chronically Ill in Public Institutions, William J. Ellis, Commissioner of Institutions and Agencies of New Jersey, and (3), the most largely attended, Public Payments to Private Agencies, Edwin D. Solenberger, Secretary of the Pennsylvania Children's Aid Society.

DIVISION X—THE IMMIGRANT

Mrs. Kenneth F. Rich, Chairman

Problems of the Immigrant, discussed by Division X, vied with such popular subjects as Child Welfare and Mental Hygiene in drawing crowded audiences at Boston. It seemed particularly appropriate to consider the present situation of newcomers from other lands, there in the birthplace of freedom. The colonial atmosphere of the Massachusetts Tercentenary was a vivid reminder of the coming of those earlier immigrants, without whose pioneering courage there would have been no "New World."

For six days, men and women from all over the Country, concentrated on the general conditions, the unique case problems and the public policies toward foreign born. The topics selected for presentation represented the timely phases—the firing line, so to speak—of immigration, deportation and naturalization questions.

The sessions of the Division opened on Monday, June 9th, on the subject "Immigration Problems at the Border," with an alarming story of exploitation at Canadian crossings, pictured by Miss Marian Blackwell, Executive of the International Institute at Buffalo; of the special problems of immigrants arriving at an Eastern port as seen by one long in the Service—the Assistant Immigration Commissioner at Boston, Mr. Frank Abercrombie; of a quiet Mexican border since the enforcement of selective tests became so strict, with facts as to the enormous decrease in Mexican immigration, and an appeal for international regulation, by Mr. James H. Batten, Executive Director of the Inter-America Foundation of Claremont, California; followed by in-

teresting and practical suggestions for the social worker and the Mexican, drawn from his experience by Reverend W. F. Mullally of the Annunciation Church of St. Louis.

In contrast to the arrival situation, the second session dealt with the processes of expulsion, under the topic, "Social Considerations in Deportability." The legal setting was provided by an attorney from the United States Department of Labor, Mr. Peter F. Snyder, Assistant to the Secretary.* For many years, Mr. Snyder helped to prepare the legislative measures considered by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives. Now it is to him that many of the appeals from deportation orders are sent by the outlying Immigration Districts. More aliens have been expelled during the current fiscal year, he stated, than ever before in the history of the United States. Mr. Snyder made it very clear that the Department considers the effects of the Deportation-Exclusion-Felony Act of March 4, 1929, with its banishment feature, unnecessarily harsh and cruel, and that the Secretary of Labor earnestly desires the right to grant permission to reapply for admission to the United States, to deportees whose record so warrants. The presiding officer, Mr. Mohler, pressed the further point that Congress should, in the interest of family unity, establish the right to reapply for admission for aliens in general, who, as relatives of foreign born in the United States, are at the time of application for an immigration visa, entitled to non quota or preference quota status. A vivid picture of the disheartening conditions under which deportees are held in detention in the United States, was drawn by Miss Jane Perry Clark of the Barnard College Faculty. Their mingling in the ordinary overcrowded dark, unsanitary county jail, with persons accused perhaps, of serious crime, is both unjust and unsafe. The large proportion of deportations because of technical irregularity in entry regulations, Miss Clark pointed out, strongly argues for the careful but wider use of bail bonds and release on their own recognizance of persons awaiting deportation. Miss Jane Adams drew the session to a climax, with her challenge as to the conflicts of deportation with social welfare. "It is an easy camouflage," she said, "for certain forms of inefficiency and corruption to blame everything on people who ought to be deported. It is easy to say that all bootlegging or all of any other type of crime is due to aliens unlawfully in this country, and an example of this attempt to cover up may be found in the recent police administration in New York. The extreme nationalistic tendency which has brought about our present immigration legislation, causes the public as a whole to judge people by their nations, and not as individuals."

On Thursday, Division X held a joint session with Division II, presided over by that wise and persuasive dean of criminologists, Dr. George W.

Kirchwey of the New York School of Social Work, and centered in the topic, "Nationality as a Factor in Delinquency." Miss Edith Abbott, Dean of the Graduate School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago, opened the discussion with a survey of national attitudes, tracing the recurring attitude of suspicion toward newcomers from the time of the early Irish immigrants to the latest Mexicans. Division X was in the very fortunate position of listening in advance to material prepared for Miss Abbott's next forthcoming book,—to the outstanding person in the United States who has made problems of both crime and immigration the basis of scholarly and authoritative research. Mr. Clifford Shaw, Head of the Department of Research Sociology of the Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago, illustrated "delinquency areas" with maps and charts, and drew the tentative conclusion that delinquency seems to bear a far more direct relationship to environment, than it apparently bears to any such factor as nationality. Prof. Max S. Handman, of the University of Texas, closed the session with a report on the situation in the Southwest. He has carefully searched the communities of his State to which Mexican immigration has been older than to other parts of the United States, for prevalence of crime among Mexicans, only to find that their offences are in far less proportion than is their percentage in the population, and that those committed tend to be minor rather than more serious misdeeds.

The next session revolved about the "International Aspects of Work with the Foreign Born." Miss Ruth Larned, International Field Secretary of the International Migration Service, introduced the subject with a penetrating analysis of the considerations in emigration and immigration under the title, "Unravelling the Threads of Migrant Family Life." The possibilities of such international case work opened out with new implications and responsibilities, and brought a fresh sense of gratitude for the gallant leadership of the International Migration Service in this field. The way the problem looks from across the water, was appealingly elaborated by Miss Eugenia Taussigova, of the Czechoslovak Red Cross, from Prague. Miss Mary McDowell, Head of the University of Chicago Settlement stirred the audience to action by pointing out the next steps for separated families, and the legislation so critically needed in behalf of parents, husbands, wives and children. A resolution in this connection was drawn up by a Committee whose appointment followed Miss McDowell's speech, and was adopted on the last day of the Conference. It calls attention especially to the situation of the families of legally domiciled aliens, whose naturalization is delayed or impossible, and whose reunion cannot therefore take place until the Immigration Act is further amended. Those present pledged themselves to that end, agreeing with Miss McDowell that only by such a step, can

the United States "do justly, love kindness and walk humbly before the foreign born, under the topic, "Naturalization Policy and Law." Mrs. Leo Bernstein, Chairman of the Committee on Naturalization and Citizenship of the Council on Adult Education of the Foreign Born, in New York City, explained the new naturalization legislation and its shortcomings, calling attention especially to the hardships in the large increase in naturalization fees and to the desirability of extending the legalization of entry privilege to persons who arrived prior to July 1, 1924 (the date of the present Immigration Act,) instead of merely to those who arrived prior to June 3, 1921.

She was followed by Miss Mary L. Guyton, State Supervisor of Adult Alien Education, of the Massachusetts State Department of Education on the suggestive topic, "Dovetailing the United States Naturalization Service with Boards of Education." There is educational opportunity for all the foreign born in Massachusetts. Those applying for naturalization receive special invitations to attend public school classes, from the Division of University Extension under which Miss Guyton's work is carried on. The remarkable work of this Division, particularly of Miss Guyton's own office, and that of the Division of Immigration and Americanization under Mrs. Thayer, made the representatives of other states envious for their own communities. Massachusetts is a challenge to go and do likewise!

The last speaker for the Division was Miss Dorothy Straus, a brilliant New York attorney, a member of the Committee on Legal Status of Women of the National League of Women Voters. Miss Straus explained especially, the status of amendments to the Cable Act, relating to independent citizenship for married women, the position of persons of dual nationality as well as of persons without a country, and carried the discussion into the only arena where citizenship questions can ever be satisfactorily settled in her presentation of the "Nationality of Individuals in an International World."

The members of Division X, and its audiences parted reluctantly, to meet again in Minneapolis in 1931. They hope that the platform for legislative amendments which emerged from the week of meetings will, during the coming year, be made the basis for effective Congressional effort by workers with the foreign born.

* The addresses by Mr. Snyder and Miss Clark have been issued in the form of an Interpreter Release, June 24, 1930, Vol. VII, No. 22, which may be secured from the Foreign Language Information Service, 222 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

DIVISION XI — PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND EDUCATION

Frank J. Bruno, Chairman

The Committee in charge of Division XI decided at its first meeting that it would attempt to conduct the sessions at the Conference without formal discussion from the floor in the belief that the subject matter to be presented was of the sort which did not lend itself well to free discussion.

In place of open discussion at the regular sessions of the Division there were discussants who had prepared for participation, each being given ten minutes. The time schedule was so arranged that there was a margin of five minutes at each session and the speakers held to their assignments with such accuracy that every session ended a minute or two before the close of the period.

The meetings were devoted to two subjects: the background disciplines on which training for social work should be built, and the integration of field work with the class room courses. Three sessions were devoted to the basic disciplines, one session to field work and the round tables period was also devoted to field work.

Most of the discussions of training that have been undertaken by this Division concerned themselves with the curriculum of the training schools, and little effort had been made to define or even to describe what the student should have in the way of preparation before he reaches them. The Committee planned one more paper than it was possible to secure. The subject of economics was not discussed because no economist seemed to be willing to tackle the job. With that exception, however, the subjects which the Committee originally planned to cover were handled with more or less success. The contributions had the unevenness of first efforts, some of the speakers fitting themselves exactly into the picture and others discussing the discipline rather better than its relationship to social work. The two outstanding contributions were those of Miss Cannon who discussed philosophy as the point of view and the reason for the whole structure of social work, in a most brilliant manner, and Professor Robinson who handled probably the most difficult subject of all, that of psychology on which social work has leaned so heavily in the past decade. His sane and measured plea for a grasp of psychology will not soon be forgotten.

Dr. Robinson summed up the expectations of fundamental psychological training as follows:

"The crying need these days is that in respect to human nature we attain two things: greater emotional poise and a more critical sense of fact. I believe that the right kind of psychological training is capable of protecting one to a considerable degree from impassioned forces of partisanship while at the same time giving one sufficient intellectual confidence to discourage the enjoyment of mys-

tical bafflement. I believe that the right kind of training in psychology will add substantially to one's positive knowledge of human nature and also to one's honest ignorance. And I believe that no one who is to enter a profession in which the uncovering of special human facts in connection with special human problems is to be of paramount importance can afford to neglect those varied methods of inquiry which are at the heart of psychological science."

"It looks as if there were plenty of material in social work for a code of ethics but no formulation," Miss Cannon stated in her paper. "I am quite willing to do without a code, but I believe that students need to be given some insight into the nature of the ethical problems of social work and some exercise in thinking in general as well as in particular terms."

"I am an advocate of pure science or idle curiosity as a motive in social work and in life. Knowledge as well as beauty is its own excuse for being. But the purest science runs into philosophy. Social work in keeping itself philosophically oriented need not lose any of its impulse toward exactitude. Indeed the more scientific it can become, the better, philosophically and ethically speaking."

Probably next in order is Mrs. Glenn's paper on history treated from the point of view of the unity of the human race and the insight into present behavior with a sympathetic understanding of the stories of past ages gives to its possessor. Dr. Hankins' paper, his scholarly, careful discussion of the biological background, stressed rather more the racial and biological factors and rather less the cultural influences than would probably be done by most sociologists. Father Schwitalla's paper pointed out the way in which the newer discoveries in biology are softening the determinism of the biologists of the last generation and giving hope to the social worker of the modifiability of human character through other than genetic processes. Mr. Fitch assembled a valuable body of data, including some statistical material, in support of his thesis of the importance of understanding and if possible influencing the strong industrial forces in which the present generation is caught, and with whose wreckage social work concerns itself. The state in its function of protection and service, as well as for the maintenance of law and order was stressed by Dr. Carter of the Cleveland Foundation as an ally for social work which is only partially recognized.

These contributions should be used as a point of departure for further studies in this field partly to determine whether they are essential for the training of social workers, and partly whether there are other disciplines of a special or of a general sort which are equal or of greater importance.

The discussions on field work centered around the questions of protect-

ing it from influences which might endanger its status as a university course on the assumption that only as a course accredited by a university may its educational value be insured. The other point of view was its value as a practice in research, the formation of habit of approach to problems important for the social worker to acquire and to use in his activities in the social work field.

The round tables varied greatly in their success. Coming at the last day of the Conference and the last period, many people had already left or were leaving so that the number at some of the round tables was small.

DIVISION XII—EDUCATIONAL PUBLICITY

Charles C. Stillman, Chairman

The meetings of the youngest division of the Conference were this year marked by unusually large audiences largely made up of people who are actually doing educational social work publicity. Attendance at the meetings varied between 150 and 250.

Opening by joining with the Health Division in a session on "Clinics as Centers of Health Education", the division sessions were brought to a close by Dean Roscoe Pound's brilliant address on "Public Opinion and Social Control." Throughout the program there was presented material full of real meaning and help to those particularly responsible for interpreting social work. That those engaged in social work publicity are in little danger of becoming too similar in their methods and ideas was evidenced by the spirited discussions which followed the papers presented.

Speaking on "The Philosophical Basis of Educational Publicity in Social Work", Leon Whipple, of The Survey, gave a masterly and enlightening paper well worthy of a place of honor beside his now famous Des Moines paper on "The Magic Gift of Style."

A series of group discussions covering a variety of subjects from budgeting for publicity through statistics gave a wide range of choice to the publicity worker seeking help on specific problems. A joint meeting was held with the Division on Organization of Social Forces.

W. Brooke Graves, of Temple University, author of the now famous volume on "Readings in Public Opinion" attended his first Conference to address the division on "The Factual Basis of Social Work Publicity."

Declaring that he "had little faith in the capacity of people to weigh facts", Mr. Graves expressed "great faith in the power of dominating personalities, possessed of the capacity for leadership." "What people want is not so much to do the thing themselves, as to see that it is well done," he commented.

The necessity of adopting certain material to different groups, methods

of reducing the consequent expense of such a measure, the necessity of securing dramatic effects and the avoiding of what Professor Overstreet terms "fuzzy abstractness" were some of Mr. Graves' recommendations.

"The concentration of the power to control public policy in the hands of a group of experts creates a danger of the wrecking of human society, but it also creates the hope for its substantial improvement," he concluded in expressing his opinion that our technique of control is in its infancy.

Miss Louise Clevenger, of the St. Paul Community Chest in discussing Mr. Graves' paper pointed out that most social work publicity had been based on what she termed the "faith approach", now about to be supplanted by the "fact-approach."

"I must say that if we must have an exaggerated portrayal in our material that I much prefer exaggerated faith to exaggerated facts," she said.

"Nobody can quarrel with those who have an exaggerated faith in social work and its results. But I am rather inclined to believe that the fact-material can not be quite so loosely handled, even for dramatic effect, as the faith-material."

The fitting of factual evidence to audiences made up of people who are leaders who want the facts and who have the intelligence and skill to deal with them when they are gathered and coordinated into intelligible wholes can do much in strengthening the faith of the general public in social work, she declared.

At a meeting on "The Application of Education Principles to Social Work Publicity", Arthur J. Todd, of Northwestern University declared that although he could find "no principles of education applicable to social work publicity" that there were three basic considerations of education: to know the group it works upon, to formulate a purposive objective and to arrive at a procedure.

"Sound social education emphasizes team work in the learning process itself and develops a group consciousness, a sense of ultimate partnership," Mr. Todd pointed out.

He concluded with this interesting definition:

"The specialist in social work publicity needs to have his own specialty so informed by a workable philosophy that he will become not a mere phrase-man, a routinier, a slogan-monger, a clever apologist, a little brother to the racketeer, but rather a focal center of genuine creative thinking, the reflector of humanizing philosophy, the evoker of a participation which will tap not only stores of money but discover unsuspected strata of human interest, sympathy and aptitude for personal service in our common enterprise."

Edwin G. Eklund of the Welfare Council of New York City, stressed particularly the educational principles of participation.

Pioneer modes of thought enter into the public opinion with which social legislation must wrestle, Dean Pound said, in discussing "Public Opinion and Social Control."

"It must be interpreted and applied on a background of many converging traditions which have entered deeply into the settled American habits of thought which we call public opinion. There is the Puritan tradition formative in a time of transition from a society in which organized religion had divided authority with political organization to one in which the political organization was to be paramount. There is the Whig tradition formative in a time of transition following the breakdown of the authoritarian thought and relational social order of the Middle Ages. There is the American democratic tradition formative in a time of transition following the casting off of the colonial regime and in the adaptation of English institutions to the New World. There is the pioneer tradition, formative in a time of expansion and rapid setting up of new commonwealths, when independence, self-reliance, versatility, restlessness, and proneness to be on the move, impatience of form and ceremony and carelessness of the amenities were political and economic virtues. We must study these things and appraise their weight in what we may call the public opinion of today if we would know how to make the social legislation of the immediate future more effective for its purposes."

COMMITTEE ON THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Lewis Meriam, Chairman

Spontaneous, animated, even at times heated, discussion characterized the two meetings of the Committee on the American Indian. The policy of extreme paternalism which the national government has pursued in dealing with its oldest social and educational responsibility did not entirely lack defenders or apologists. Roger Baldwin participated in the discussion so that those to whom all paternalism is anathema were ably and forcefully represented. The majority of those who participated in the discussion fell well within these two extremes. After the time limit of the second meeting expired the audience broke into little groups to continue the discussions on the sidewalk in front of the old Arlington Church. The subject of discipline and corporal punishment in Indian Schools was especially contro-

versial. The relationship of the national government to state and local governments and private agencies was only a little less so.

Herbert Joseph Spinden, President of the Eastern Association of Indian Affairs, presented a stimulating paper on the "Social Background of the American Indians" which should be available to all Indian boys and girls of high school age and should be compulsory reading for all employees in the United States Indian Service. He described the high state of civilization that had been attained by some of the Indian tribes in Central and South America prior to the advent of the Spaniards. In astronomy and the related mathematics they were in advance of their conquerors. Their higher developed village life and civilization made them far easier victims for their conquerors than were the primitive wandering tribes that could easily escape from the advancing whites. Thus the more advanced Indians were destroyed while the more primitive escaped.

W. David Owl, a North Carolina Cherokee Indian, a graduate of the old Indian department of Hampton Institute, and now the missionary in charge of the Baptist-Presbyterian Indian Churches on the Cattaraugus Reservation in New York spoke on "What the Indians Want from the Government". Mr. Owl may be characterized as a conservative progressive. His paper was entirely free from that bitterness which is so often present when progressive Indians discuss the United States Indian Service. His criticisms were implied rather than explicit. Coming from Indians who have long been in contact with whites and have largely lost their old economic and cultural background he urges merging in the economic life of the whites. Higher education for Indian youth, the development of native leadership, and vocational education, vocational guidance and placement he especially emphasized. Four H Clubs and Boy Scout work were particularly commended.

Miss Julia C. Lathrop, took exception to the subject which had been assigned her "What the Indian Service Needs" as somewhat presumptuous. She recognized the extreme difficulties of the task that confronts the new Commissioners of Indian Affairs, the revitalizing of an old service, a task compared with which, she said, the organization of the Chil-

dren's Bureau was child's play. She especially commended the spirit of public service which animated Commissioners Rhoads and Scattergood in leaving their successful private enterprises to undertake so difficult and so thankless a task and she bespoke for them consideration and cooperation. From her own experience she bore witness to the possibilities of gradually bringing the personnel of the Indian Service to a high standard through effective cooperation with the United States Civil Service Commission. She especially urged well trained social workers to seek positions in the Indian Service because there they would find unique opportunities for constructive social and educational work.

John R. T. Reeves, Chief Counsel of the Office of Indian Affairs presented calmly and dispassionately a carefully prepared paper on "What the New Indian Administration is Doing". High points of achievement have been securing adequate appropriations for supplying Indian children in boarding schools with at least the minimum standard diet recommended by a competent committee of experts, for materially improving the clothing standards, and for improving the institutional equipment and increasing the amount of hired help so that child labor will be reduced at the schools. The appointments of Robert S. Lansdale, who is well known to social workers as a personal representative of the Commissioner to be concerned mainly with personnel and A. C. Cooley as chief agriculturist were also mentioned among the accomplishments. The announcement of the selection of a new director of education by a committee of competent experts with the chief examiner of the Civil Service Commission as chairman was particularly well received by the audience.

At an informal luncheon of the Indian Group, the Indians were in charge of the program. The speakers were Henry Roe Cloud and David Owl. Mrs. Henry Roe Cloud who presided ably at the opening meeting, was kept away from the luncheon by one of her numerous speaking engagements. All the Indians present were of the conservative progressive type. It is hoped that at Minneapolis next year it will be possible to have a larger number of Indians participate in the program. What the Indians contributed at Boston makes the group eager for more.

THE CONFERENCE BULLETIN
OF THE
NATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF SOCIAL WORK

277 East Long Street, Columbus, Ohio

President, Richard C. Cabot, Boston.

Treasurer, Charles C. Stillman, Columbus.

General Secretary and Editor of the Bulletin,
Howard R. Knight, Columbus, Ohio.

AUGUST, 1930

Published four times a year by the National
Conference of Social Work, in May,
August, November and February.

Price fifty cents a year, fifteen cents a copy.
(Membership Directory, 25 cents)

Sent all members in consideration of
payment of fifty cents as part of
Membership fee.

Entered as second-class matter at Colum-
bus, Ohio, March 21, 1921, under the Act of
August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing
at special rate of postage provided for in
Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917,
authorized March 21, 1921.

OFFICERS

1930-1931

President

RICHARD C. CABOT, M. D., Boston

First Vice-President

C. M. BOOKMAN, Cincinnati

Second Vice-President

JANE M. HOEY, New York

Third Vice-President

HARRY L. LURIE, Chicago

Treasurer

CHARLES C. STILLMAN, Columbus

General Secretary

HOWARD R. KNIGHT, Columbus

Executive Committee

Ex-officio: Richard C. Cabot, Presi-
dent; C. M. Bookman, First Vice
President; Charles C. Stillman, Treas-
urer.

Term expiring 1931—Jane Addams,
Chicago; Frank J. Bruno, St. Louis;
Owen R. Lovejoy, New York; J.
Prentice Murphy, Philadelphia.

Term expiring 1932—Otto F. Brad-
ley, Minneapolis; Bradley Buell, New
Orleans; Edith N. Burleigh, Los An-
geles; Margaret E. Rich, New Or-
leans; Eva Whiting White, Boston.

Term expiring 1933—Joanna C. Col-
cord, New York; Louise Cottrell,
Portland; Dorothy C. Kahn, Philadel-
phia; Ellen C. Potter, M. D., Trenton;
and Clare M. Tousley, New York.

Chairmen of Divisions—Katherine
F. Lenroot, Washington; Miriam Van
Waters, Los Angeles; Robert W. Kel-
so, St. Louis; Paul L. Benjamin,
Louisville; Reverend Frederic Sieden-
burg, Chicago; Robbins Gilman, Min-
neapolis; E. Van Norman Emery, New
Haven; Raymond Clapp, Cleveland;
Leroy A. Halbert, Providence; Mar-
ian Schibsky, New York; Joanna Col-
cord, New York; and Leon Whipple,
New York.

Conference Committees

(Following are the committees for 1930-
1931, including the new members and offi-
cers elected at Boston. All those appointed
or elected have not yet accepted.)

Program Committee

Ex-officio

Richard C. Cabot, Cambridge.
Miriam Van Waters, Los Angeles.
Howard R. Knight, Columbus, Ohio.

1930-1931

Almena Dawley, Philadelphia.
Reverend Robert F. Keegan, New York City.

1930-1932

Mrs. Irene Farnham Conrad, New Orleans.
Shelby M. Harrison, New York City.

1930-1933

Otto F. Bradley, Minneapolis.
Cheney C. Jones, Boston.

Committee on Resolutions

Parker B. Field, Boston, Chairman.
Emil G. Steger, St. Louis.
Alice E. Richard, Cincinnati.

Committee on Nominations

Karl de Schweinitz, Philadelphia, Chairman.
David C. Adie, Buffalo.
Harriet E. Anderson, Louisville.
R. E. Arne, Berkeley, California.
John A. Fitch, New York City.
Mrs. June P. Guild, Richmond.
Kenneth L. Messenger, Hartford.
Philip A. Parsons, East Eugene, Oregon.
Jesse Steiner, New Orleans.

Committee on Time and Place

George R. Bedinger, Philadelphia, Chairman.
C. W. Areson, Houston, Texas.
William S. Bixby, Nashville.
C. H. Bogart, Columbus, Ohio.
Leon W. Frost, Detroit.
Marie C. Judge, Baltimore.
Dorothy King, Montreal.
Marie C. Kohler, Kohler, Wisconsin.
Mrs. Kathleen O. Larkin, New York City.
Mrs. L. Edward Lashman, New Orleans.
Harold Matthews, Columbia, Missouri.
Helen C. Mawer, Tallahassee.
Roberta Morgan, Birmingham.
Alice Newbold, Milwaukee.
Whit Pfeiffer, Kansas City, Missouri.
Frank D. Preston, Richmond.
Katherine Quigg, Pittsburgh.
Ben M. Selekman, Boston.
C. K. Warne, Spokane, Washington.
George H. B. Wright, Berkeley, California.

DIVISION I—CHILDREN

Chairman: Katherine F. Lenroot, Washing-
ton.
Vice-Chairman: Charles F. Hall, St. Paul.
Secretary: Mary Ruth Colby, Chicago.

Term Expires 1931

Mrs. Gertrude Dubinsky, Philadelphia.
Everett E. DuVall, New Haven.
Anita Eldridge, San Francisco.
Douglas Falconer, Buffalo.
Eleanor Myers, St. Louis.
Claire Sanders, Detroit.
L. Josephine Webster, Burlington, Vermont.

Term Expires 1932

Samuel Langer, San Francisco.
Caroline deF. Penniman, Middletown, Con-
necticut.

Emma C. Puschner, Indianapolis.
Edwin D. Solenberger, Philadelphia.
Mrs. A. M. Tunstall, Montgomery, Alabama.
Ethel Verry, Chicago.
Alfred F. Whitman, Boston.

Term Expires 1933

C. W. Areson, Houston, Texas.
Lawrence C. Cole, Cleveland.
Mary Frances Godley, New York City.
Luba A. Joffe, New York City.
Herman Newman, Topeka.
Forrester B. Washington, Atlanta.
Elizabeth Yerxa, Madison, Wisconsin.

DIVISION II—DELINQUENTS AND
CORRECTION

Chairman: Miriam Van Waters, Los An-
geles.
Vice-Chairman: Edith Abbott, Chicago.
Secretary: E. R. Cass, New York City.

Term Expires 1931

Sheldon Glueck, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Jane M. Hoey, New York City.
Howard W. Odum, Chapel Hill, North Caro-
lina.
E. H. Sutherland, New York City.
Miriam Van Waters, Los Angeles.
Charles Vasaly, St. Cloud, Minnesota.

Term Expires 1932

Edith Abbott, Chicago.
Jessie F. Binford, Chicago.
Mrs. Jessie Hodder, Framingham, Massa-
chusetts.
Louis N. Robinson, Swarthmore, Pennsyl-
vania.
Franklin Wilson, Muncy, Pennsylvania.

Term Expires 1933

Alfred Bettman, Cincinnati.
Hastings H. Hart, New York City.
George W. Kirchwey, New York City.
Herbert C. Parsons, Boston.
A. Warren Stearns, Boston.
George W. Wickersham, New York City.

DIVISION III—HEALTH

Chairman: Robert W. Kelso, St. Louis.
Vice-Chairman: Katharine Tucker, New
York City.
Secretary: Albert H. Jewell, Kansas City,
Missouri.

Term Expires 1931

Donald Armstrong, New York City.
Courtenay Dinwiddie, New York City.
Mary L. Hicks, Louisville.
William F. Higby, San Francisco.
Albert H. Jewell, Kansas City, Missouri.
Jessie I. Lummis, Denver.
Helen McMurchy, Ottawa.
Mary E. Murphy, Chicago.

Term Expires 1932

Haven Emerson, New York City.
Howard W. Green, Cleveland.
Bleecker Marquette, Cincinnati.
Katharine Tucker, New York City.
Charles F. Wilinsky, Boston.
C. E. A. Winslow, New Haven.

Term Expires 1933

George H. Bigelow, Boston.
Anna M. Drake, Cincinnati.
Ray H. Everett, New York City.
George Hamilton, Honolulu.
Alice M. Hill, New York City.
Ira V. Hiscock, New Haven.
Horace Morison, Boston.
Sophie C. Nelson, Boston.
W. P. Shepard, San Francisco.
Virginia R. Wing, Cleveland.

DIVISION IV—THE FAMILY

Chairman: Paul L. Benjamin, Louisville,
Kentucky.
Vice-Chairman: Florence Hutsinpillar, Wash-
ington.
Secretary: Francis H. McLean, New York
City.

Term Expires 1931

Mary F. Bogue, New York City.
Josephine Brown, New York City.
Cora Jacobs, Madison.
Anna F. Kempshall, New York City.
Mary Russell, Memphis.
Eva Smill, New Orleans.

Term Expires 1932

Caroline M. Bedford, St. Louis.
Paul L. Benjamin, Louisville.
Ruth Fitzsimons, Seattle.
Jessie M. Lukens, Brockton, Massachusetts.
Clarence A. Pretzer, Providence.
Katherine Quigg, Pittsburgh.
Jessie F. Sutton, Chicago.

Term Expires 1933

Mrs. Leona M. Evans, St. Louis.
Virginia C. Frank, Chicago.
Helen Hackett, Los Angeles.
Mary McPhedran, Vancouver, Canada.
Roberta Morgan, Birmingham, Alabama.
E. Frances O'Neill, Boston.

DIVISION V—INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Chairman: Reverend Frederic Siedenburgh, Chicago.
Vice-Chairman: Reverend F. E. Johnson, New York City.
Secretary: John B. Andrews, New York City.

Term Expires 1931

John B. Andrews, New York City.
Mrs. Katherine P. Edson, San Francisco.
John A. Fitch, New York City.
Reverend A. A. Heist, Denver.
Paul U. Kellogg, New York City.
Reverend Frederic Siedenburgh, Chicago.

Term Expires 1932

Mary Anderson, Washington.
Lucy P. Carner, New York City.
Elizabeth Christman, Chicago.
Paul H. Douglas, Chicago.
Oliver A. Friedman, Milwaukee.
Alice Hamilton, Boston.
Mrs. Paul E. Lord, Boston.
Leifur Magnusson, Washington.
Ellen Nathalie Matthews, Washington.
Edward F. McGrady, Washington.

Term Expires 1933

Linna Bresette, Washington.
Mrs. R. P. Halleck, Louisville.
Mrs. Florence Kelley, New York City.
John A. Lapp, Milwaukee.
George W. Lawson, St. Paul.
James Mullenbach, Chicago.
I. M. Rubinow, Cincinnati.
Jesse O. Thomas, Atlanta.
Norman Thomas, New York City.

DIVISION VI—NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY LIFE

Chairman: Robbins Gilman, Minneapolis.
Vice-Chairman: John L. Elliott, New York City.
Secretary: Eugene T. Lies, Chicago.

Term Expires 1931

Jane Addams, Chicago.
LeRoy E. Bowman, New York City.
Mrs. Irene Farnham Conrad, New Orleans.
Corinne Fonde, Houston, Texas.
Mrs. Robert A. Woods, Los Angeles.

Term Expires 1932

Mrs. Ethel Richardson Allen, Los Angeles.
Elizabeth Ashe, San Francisco.
George A. Bellamy, Cleveland.
Charles C. Cooper, Pittsburgh.
Eugene Kinckle Jones, New York City.
Paul U. Kellogg, New York City.
E. C. Lindeman, New York City.
Mary E. McDowell, Chicago.
J. H. Montgomery, Richmond.
Lea D. Taylor, Chicago.

Term Expires 1933

W. Gertrude Brown, Minneapolis.
Edward L. Burchard, Chicago.
Sidney A. Teller, Pittsburgh.
Mrs. Eva Whiting White, Boston.
Mrs. Robert A. Woods, Boston.

DIVISION VII—MENTAL HYGIENE

Chairman: E. Van Norman Emery, New Haven.
Vice-Chairman: Elizabeth Dexter, New York City.
Secretary: Sue H. Mason, St. Paul.

Term Expires 1931

Sylvia Allen, Charleston, South Carolina.
Hester B. Crutcher, New Haven.
Sarah Ivins, New York City.
Nancy Johnson, St. Louis.
Bradford J. Murphey, Colorado Springs.
Emerson A. North, Cincinnati.
E. Perry, Dallas.
George Stevenson, New York City.

Term Expires 1932

Edith N. Burleigh, Los Angeles.
Mildred Dewey, Boston.
Mrs. W. F. Dummer, Chicago.
June Joslyn, Milwaukee.
Paul Kubitschek, St. Louis.
Jeannette Regensburg, New York City.
Florence Sytz, New Orleans.

Term Expires 1933

Henry B. Elkind, Boston.
Elizabeth Healy, Philadelphia.
Mrs. Kathleen O. Larkin, New York City.
Ruth Lloyd, Denver, Colorado.
George J. Mohr, Chicago.
Charlotte Towle, New York City.
Anna Belle Tracy, Cleveland.

DIVISION VIII—ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL FORCES

Chairman: Raymond Clapp, Cleveland.
Vice-Chairman: Otto F. Bradley, Minneapolis.
Secretary: Arthur Dunham, Philadelphia.

Term Expires 1931

Otto F. Bradley, Minneapolis.
Raymond Clapp, Cleveland.
Mrs. George H. Clarke, Los Angeles.
Arthur Dunham, Philadelphia.
Mary Stotsenberg, Louisville.

Term Expires 1932

William F. Higby, San Francisco.
William Hodson, New York City.
Henry T. Levy, Dallas, Texas.
A. W. McMillen, Chicago.
Mabel E. Pierson, Plainfield, New Jersey.

Term Expires 1933

Allen T. Burns, New York City.
Mrs. Irene Farnham Conrad, New Orleans.
John B. Dawson, New Haven.
Arthur A. Guild, Richmond, Virginia.
David H. Holbrook, New York City.

DIVISION IX—PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND ADMINISTRATION

Chairman: L. A. Halbert, Providence.
Vice-Chairman: A. L. Bowen, Springfield, Illinois.
Secretary: Mrs. Blanche L. La Du, St. Paul.

Term Expires 1931

Jeffrey R. Brackett, Boston.
Mrs. Amy S. Braden, San Francisco.
John A. Brown, Indianapolis.
William J. Ellis, Trenton.
John L. Gillin, Madison.
Charles H. Johnson, Albany.
James S. Lakin, Charleston, West Virginia.

Term Expires 1932

Grace Abbott, Washington, D. C.
A. L. Bowen, Springfield, Illinois.
Amos W. Butler, Indianapolis.
Lincoln Frost, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Frank E. Kimball, Jefferson City, Missouri.
Mrs. Blanche L. La Du, St. Paul.
Mrs. E. S. H. McCauley, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Anna L. Saylor, Sacramento.
George W. Wilson, Washington.

Term Expires 1933

Dr. Herman Adler, Santa Barbara, California.
Frank Bane, Richmond.
Grube B. Cornish, Augusta, Maine.
Louise Cottrell, Portland, Oregon.
H. Ida Curry, New York City.

Emil Frankel, Trenton.
L. A. Halbert, Providence.
William C. Headrick, Nashville.
Ellen C. Potter, Trenton.
Louis H. Putnam, Stapleton, New York.

DIVISION X—THE IMMIGRANT

Chairman: Marian Schibbsby, New York City.
Vice-Chairman: Mrs. Mary O'Donnell Turner, Detroit.
Secretary: Carolyn E. Ware, St. Paul.

Term Expires 1931

Edith Abbott, Chicago.
Sophonisba P. Breckinridge, Chicago.
Herbert A. Miller, Columbus, Ohio.
Bruce Mohler, Washington.
Philip A. Parsons, Eugene, Oregon.
Cecilia Razovsky, New York City.
Marian Schibbsby, New York City.

Term Expires 1932

Jane Addams, Chicago.
Edith Terry Bremer, New York City.
Florence Cassidy, New York City.
Max S. Handman, Austin, Texas.
Elsie Jones, Columbus, Ohio.
Ruth Larned, New York City.
Lewis Meriam, Washington.
Reverend Robert N. McLean, Los Angeles.
Lea D. Taylor, Chicago.
Mrs. Nathaniel Thayer, Boston.

Term Expires 1933

James H. Batten, Claremont, California.
Dr. Emory S. Bogardus, Los Angeles.
B. F. Coen, Denver.
Ida L. Hull, Boston.
Leifur Magnusson, Washington.
Mary E. McDowell, Chicago.
Mrs. Ruth Crawford Mitchell, Pittsburgh.
Reverend W. F. Mullally, St. Louis.
Mrs. Kenneth F. Rich, Chicago.
Aghavnie Yegheneian, New York City.

DIVISION XI—PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND EDUCATION

Chairman: Joanna C. Colcord, New York City.
Vice-Chairman: Karl de Schweinitz, Philadelphia.
Secretary: Antoinette Cannon, New York City.

Term Expires 1931

Henrietta S. Additon, New York City.
F. Stuart Chapin, New York City.
Elizabeth Dixon, Chicago.
Cecil C. North, Columbus, Ohio.
Kenneth L. M. Pray, Philadelphia.

Term Expires 1932

Henry M. Busch, Cleveland.
Martha A. Chickering, Piedmont, California.
Bessie A. McClenahan, Los Angeles.
Jesse F. Steiner, New Orleans.
Walter M. West, New York City.

Term Expires 1933

Frank J. Bruno, St. Louis.
C. C. Carstens, New York City.
Almena Dawley, Philadelphia.
Rose J. McHugh, Washington.
Gertrude Vaile, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

DIVISION XII—EDUCATIONAL PUBLICITY

Chairman: Leon R. Whipple, New York City.
Vice-Chairman: Louise M. Clevenger, St. Paul.
Secretary: Horace H. Hughes, Philadelphia.

Term Expires 1931

Louise Franklin Bache, New York City.
Thomas Devine, Jacksonville.
Olga Gunkle, Denver.
Robert Horan, Louisville.

Term Expires 1932

F. D. Preston, Richmond.
Ralph J. Reed, Omaha.
Evart G. Routzahn, New York City.
Chester Rowell, Berkeley, California.
Harding L. White, Boston.
Virginia R. Wing, Cleveland.

Term Expires 1933

Paul S. Bliss, St. Louis.
Philip L. Ketchum, Tucson, Arizona.
Charles I. Madison, Des Moines.
Mrs. Mary Swain Routzahn, New York City.
Mrs. Gertrude H. Springer, Forest Hills, Long Island, New York.

Don't Miss Minneapolis

- THE -

FIFTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING

National Conference of Social Work

Minneapolis, Minnesota

JUNE 14 to 20, 1931

For Detailed Information

Write to the Conference Office

HOWARD R. KNIGHT, General Secretary
277 East Long Street
Columbus, Ohio

*The fifty-ninth meeting will be held
in Philadelphia in 1932.*

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

MAY 28, 1929, TO MAY 27, 1930

This statement is taken from the Auditor's Report which is on file at the Conference Office. The accounts of the Conference were audited by A. L. Peters, C. P. A., on May 27, 1930.

Receipts

Memberships	\$26,714.00
Registrations	890.65
Contributions	200.00
Expenses refunded by San Francisco Committee	395.40
Sales, Bulletins	300.47
Sales, Proceedings	618.56
Interest	223.80
Refunds	118.25
Total Receipts	\$29,461.13
Balance at beginning of period	4,526.34
Total Cash to account for	\$33,987.47

Disbursements

Salaries	\$15,523.41
Traveling expenses	6,272.51
Printing, (not including \$1,204.65 unpaid)*	5,552.42
Postage	1,470.34
Supplies	651.75
Telephone and Telegraph	443.53
Rent and Light	1,228.78
Equipment and Repairs	353.50
Miscellaneous	842.91
Refunds	37.00
Total Disbursements	\$32,376.15

Balance at end of period

1,611.32

Functional Distribution of Expenditures

Administration	\$11,971.76
Membership Promotion and Publicity	2,931.84
Annual Meeting	4,539.66
Proceedings (not including \$1,204.65 unpaid)*	3,514.84
Bulletin	1,374.64
Office Operation	7,591.49
Other	451.92

\$32,376.15

* This bill has since been paid.

